DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 908 EA 020 472

AUTHOR Clune, William H.; White, Paula A.
TITLE School-Based Management. Institutional Variation, Implementation, and Issues for Further Research. CPRE Research Report Series RR-008.
INSTITUTION Center for Policy Research in Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 88
GRANT OERI-G008690011
NOTE 46p.; For related document, see EA 020 473.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, Douglass Campus, New Brunswick, NY 08901 ($4.00; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; Administrative Organization; *Administrative Policy; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; Enrollment Rate; Literature Reviews; *Management Systems; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; *School Based Management
IDENTIFIERS Policy Research

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the findings of a study (based on telephone interviews) of over 30 school-based management programs. Examined are the changes in roles, the strengths and limitations of various approaches, and the conditions most favorable to success. There are four main sections: (1) literature review; (2) research questions and methods; (3) research findings; and (4) a conclusion that presents recommendations for further research. The literature review and the section on research findings cover some common topics: operation and objectives, changed roles, evaluation and monitoring, and costs and problems of implementation. It is suggested that future research be concentrated in the areas of decentralization, program evaluation, organizational roles, implementation difficulties, and conflicts with state and district regulations. A list of interview respondents, a school-based management questionnaire, a list of student enrollment figures, and 14 references are appended. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300908

CPRE
CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
a consortium:

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

Michigan State University

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-MADISON

EA 020 472

School-Based Management

Institutional Variation, Implementation, and Issues for Further Research

William H. Clune
and
Paula A. White

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION (CPRE)

CPRE unites four of the nation's leading research institutions in a unique venture to improve the quality of schooling. The consortium members are: the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; the School of Education at Michigan State University; the School of Education at Stanford University; and the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, CPRE conducts research on the implementation and effects of state and local education policies. By communicating its findings to policymakers, the Center attempts to contribute to the framing of education policies that will have a positive impact on children in classrooms.

CPRE's research activities are concentrated in five major areas:

- Policies on Curriculum and Student Standards
- Teacher Policies
- Educational Indicators and Monitoring
- New Roles and Responsibilities
- Evolution of the Reform Movement

In addition to conducting research in these areas, CPRE publishes reports and briefs on a variety of education issues. The Center also sponsors regional workshops for state and local policymakers.

CPRE Research Report Series

Research Reports are issued by CPRE to facilitate the exchange of ideas among policymakers and researchers who share an interest in education policy. The views expressed in the reports are those of individual authors, and are not necessarily shared by the U.S. Department of Education, CPRE, or its institutional partners. This publication was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, grant number OERI-G008690011.

To obtain copies of this and other CPRE publications, contact: Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ 08901; attention: Publications. Phone: (201) 828-3872.

CPRE
CENTER FOR
POLICY RESEARCH
IN EDUCATION
a consortium:

School-Based Management

Institutional Variation, Implementation, and Issues for Further Research

William H. Clune
and
Paula A. White

September 1988

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

Michigan State University

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-MADISON

CPRE Research Report Series RR-008

CONTENTS

SUMMARY v

FOREWORD vii

Section

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW 3
Definition and Objectives of School-Based Management 3
Structure and Operation of School-Based Management 4
School-Based Management Councils 5
School-Based Management and Accountability 6
Changed Roles 7

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY 9

IV. FINDINGS 11
Organization and 0peration 11
Summary 11
Some Descriptive Statistics 12
Duration and Origin 12
Objectives 13
Type and Degree of Decentralization 14
School-Based Management Councils 17
Changed Roles 19
Summary 19
Role of the Principal 19
Role of the Superintendent 20
Role of the School-Based Management Council 20
Role of the School Board 21
Role of Teachers 21
Role of the Teachers' Union 22
Role of Students, Parents and Community 23

Issues in the Administration and Implementation of School-Based Management 23
Summary 23
Autonomy and Accountability to External Authority 24
Criteria of Success and Methods of Evaluation 25
Implementation Problems and Program Costs 27

V. CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 31

APPENDICES
A: Interview Respondents 33
B: School-based Management Questionnaire 37
C: Student Enrollments 39

REFERENCES 41

SUMMARY

This paper reports on a study of school-based management (SBM) programs completed by the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE). Researchers conducted telephone interviews with persons involved in over 30 different SBM programs. Questions were focussed on details of institutional structure, changes in roles, and implementation.

While the philosophy of SBM programs is very similar across programs, the organization and operation of programs is extremely diverse. Districts seem to decentralize budget most readily, followed by hiring, then curriculum. SBM programs are more common and more easily implemented in smaller districts.

Principals play the central role in SBM programs. They act as instructional leader, mediator of shared governance, site manager, and focus of accountability. However, without the support of the superintendent, decentralization is not likely to occur. SBM is not generally a system of teacher governance, but teachers allegedly have better access and more influence in decisions about school improvement.

Participants say that SBM enhances both accountability and autonomy. Accountability is enhanced because of clear lines of responsibility. Autonomy benefits from decentralization. Respondents do not see state and district regulation as an obstacle to site autonomy because of an appropriate emphasis on regulating objectives rather than process.

Consistent with a theory of democratic accountability, systematic monitoring of SBM is quite rare, whether of student achievement or other outcomes.

Implementation problems revolve around the difficulty of new roles required in SBM. Principals and teachers may lack the disposition and training for new kinds of decision making and new relationships. Time and resources may be lacking for training and staff development.

Further research is needed on the impact of varying degrees of decentralization, participation of teachers, model methods of training and selection of administrators, factors responsible for long term success, and possible conflicts with increasing state and local regulation.

FOREWORD

Because of its strategic position at the crossroads of these major trends in state and local policy, school-based management (SBM) was chosen as a topic for exploratory research by the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE). This paper reports on a study (based on telephone interviews) of over 30 programs of SBM. This paper examines changes in roles, the strengths and limitations of various approaches, and the conditions most favorable to success, It also makes recommendations for further research.

An additional publication of the Center for Policy Research in Education may also be useful to researchers and policymakers interested in school-based management: Resource Materials on School-Based Management, by Paula White (1988). That document contains an annotated bibliography of research on school-based management and a list of school-based management programs and contact persons at the programs.

* * * * * *

William H. Clune is Voss-Bascom Professor of Law at the University of Wisconsin Law School, director of the Wisconsin branch of the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), and a member of the executive board of the LaFollette Institute of Public Affairs at Wisconsin. His research on education policy has examinations of school finance, school law, implementation, special education, and public employee interest arbitration. His current research with CPRE concerns the effects of graduation requirements and other student standards, school-site autonomy, and regulation of the curriculum.

Paula A. White is a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She holds masters degrees in political science and educational policy studies. Her dissertation topic in the Department of Educational Policy Studies is on decentralized control of schools and teacher empowerment. Ms. White also has served as research assistant for a study aimed at identifying district actions that change the locus of decision-making authority in ways intended to increase the effectiveness of instruction.

I. INTRODUCTION

School-based management (SBM) is a system designed to improve education by increasing the authority of actors at the school site. The idea has been around a long time (34 years in one of the districts we examined); but it has become much more popular in the last decade for two reasons: the importance ascribed to school site-management by research on school effectiveness (Purkey & Smith, 1985) and the so-called "second wave" of education reform concerned with deregulation and decentralization (compare U.S. Department of Education, 1984, with Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). In a broad perspective, the current movement toward decentralization can be interpreted in various ways. It might represent the end of the "one best system" (Tyack, 1974) and its replacement with a less cumbersome system of flexible management (Peters & Waterman, 1982). At the other extreme, it might represent the customary weak countermovement in an historical trend toward ever greater centralization. And it might represent something in between--for example, a new compromise of autonomy and accountability born of the clash between the "two reform movements."

Because of its strategic position at the crossroads of these major trends in state and local policy, SBM was chosen as a topic for exploratory research by the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE). This paper reports on a study (based on telephone interviews) of over 30 programs of SBM. Previous research has been scanty on the institutional details of these programs. This paper will develop a typology of models, examine changes in roles, discuss the strengths and limitations of various approaches, probe the conditions most favorable to success, and make recommendations for further research.

This paper has four main sections: literature review, research questions and methods, research findings and conclusions and recommendations for further research. The literature review and the section on research findings cover some common topics: operation and objectives, changed roles, evaluation and monitoring, costs and problems of implementation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

DEFINITION AND OBJECTIVES OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

School-based management goes by many different names including school-site autonomy, school-site management, school-centered management, decentralized management, school-based budgeting, school-site lump sum budgeting, responsible autonomy, shared governance, the autonomous school concept, school-based curriculum development and administrative decentralization. For simplicity, and because it is one of the most widely used terms, the term school-based management will be used throughout this study.

In general, school-based management (SBM) refers to increased authority at the school site. Lindelow (1981) defines SBM as a system of educational administration in which the school is the primary unit of educational decision-making. The major rationale behind SBM is the belief that the closer a decision is made to a student served by the decision, the better it is likely to serve the student. With adequate authority at the school level, many important decisions affecting personnel, curriculum and the use of resources can be made by the people who are in the best position to make them (those who are most aware of problems and needs). A definition emphasizing local ownership appears in a handout on SBM in the St. Louis schools (Wiesner, 1987):

> School-based management is a concept designed to underscore and attain an operating method whereby individual District schools at all levels have a high degree of management authority. Only by involving people in their own professional destiny can real concern, creativity, and initiative be stimulated for the benefit of students.

Pierce (1977) proposes SBM as a means of accountability (more coherent, understandable schooling and greater school responsiveness). Guthrie (1977) cites efficiency.

STRUCTURE AND OPERATION OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

Variation in the structure and operation of SBM programs is inevitably produced by the process of local needs assessment and planning; but a common core of features distinguishes SBM from more centralized management. Three kinds of decisions are typically decentralized: budget, curriculum, and personnel.

School-based budgeting refers to the delegation of budgetary authority. Greenhalgh (1984), compares the budget process in a centralized and decentralized school district:

> In a centrally administered school district, the finalization of a budget is buried deep within a central office accounting complex. In a decentralized school district, the budget of each instructional center is developed by building leaders, staff members, parents, students, and community members, assembling information in a fish bowl atmosphere. (p. 5)

According to Caldwell (1978), school-based budgeting is based on the assumption that school personnel are best suited to determine the allocation of resources which will best meet the needs of the students. The budget process in a decentralized management system provides greater efficiency in the allocation of resources, increased flexibility in the instructional program, and a shifting of accountability to the school level. Under SBM, the principal budgetary function of the district is the allocation of funds to each school (usually based on the number of students and special school needs).

School-based curriculum development refers to the delegation of decisions regarding the curriculum to the school site. Knight (1985) defines school-based curriculum development as "...a change that was the product of creativity within a school that led to a change in curriculum content" (p. 38). According to Prasch (1984), the district should have a recommended rather than a required course of study and establish guidelines and procedures by which a school can legitimately use other materials. District and state interests in the curriculum should be expressed in terms of goals, objectives, and expected outcomes, since the method of producing these results is best left in the hands of the building staff. Under SBM, principal, teachers and parents work together to design, modify and implement courses as well as select textbooks.

Decisions regarding the selection of staff are also moved to the building

level. The teachers and school-site council are involved in the hiring process, but it is usually the principal who has final authority over the hiring and firing of personnel. Garms, Guthrie and Pierce (1978) insist that the authority to hire personnel is essential if the principal is to be held accountable for the school's performance. Gasson (1972) explains how staff selection works in a decentralized system:

> Information about specific vacancies in each school would be available at the central office, and principals would be responsible for hiring their own teachers. Applicants would be allowed to visit the school so that the principal could talk informally with them and explain the educational philosophy of his school. (p. 84)

Teachers are able to apply for positions in schools with principals who have an educational philosophy consistent with their own. The staff selection process in a decentralized system also allows for increased flexibility to meet the needs of students and programs at each individual school. "A building may choose to have more aides but fewer classroom teachers. Another is free to place a higher value on counseling services, for instance, by hiring more counselors than other schools" (Prasch, 1984, p. 29).

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT COUNCILS

SBM usually includes the creation of a school council composed of the principal, teachers, parents, community members and students (at the high school level). The council goes by many different names including SBM council, team management council, parent advisory council, school-site advisory council, local school advisory committee, school community council and SBM team. For the purposes of this study, the term SBM council will be used.

The selection, composition, and responsibilities of the council vary from district to district. While in some programs, membership on the council is decided on the basis of an election, in most instances membership is on a voluntary basis. According to Beaubier and Thayer (1973), the basic rationale behind the SBM council is to provide a method to improve communication and understanding between the school and community. The Educational Alternatives Committee of Minneapolis, Minnesota (1982), suggests that the essential function of the SBM

council is to determine program priorities and to allocate the school's budget in accordance with them.

According to the California State Department of Education in a monograph entitled "Establishing School-Site Councils" (1977), the responsibilities of the council include developing a school improvement plan, continuously reviewing the implementation of the plan, assessing the effectiveness of the school program, reviewing and updating the school improvement plan, and establishing the annual school improvement budget. Guthrie (1977), indicates that the SBM council takes an advisory role regarding budget allocation, textbook purchase, and personnel selection, with strong input in the selection of the principal. Weischadle (1980), states that the SBM council assists the principal by participating in policy development and priority setting. According to Garms, Guthrie and Pierce (1978), councils negotiate with teachers on the goals of the school's educational plan. Marburger (1985), believes that the SBM council is the most important element for the implementation of SBM.

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Advocates claim that the aims of accountability are better served through SBM. SBM "...provides a mechanism for making professional educators more accountable for their performance. Accountability would shift from the district level to the school site" (Pierce, 1976, p. 176). Caputo (1980) defines accountability in somewhat metaphoric terms:

> Accountability means to indicate, to fend against reproach, to prove to be valid and true, to justify one's actions. Accountability is one of the essential duties of the higher authority toward the lower formations. The principle of accountability requires that the school principal use his authority toward the teacher, to have them justify what they are doing in the classroom. Superintendents are required to do the same with principals. (p. 5)

According to Benveniste (1984), better accountability means, first, attracting good people to teaching and making teaching a desirable profession and, second, finding ways of making teachers, students and the community more responsible and committed to education.

CHANGED ROLES

SBM requires the restructuring of most roles in the school district: superintendent, school board, students, teachers, parents and the community. The SBM council establishes new lines of communication between administrators and teachers, between professionals and nonprofessionals, and between the school staff and the school board. The literature emphasizes the importance of the role of the principal in SBM. According to Weischadle (1980), the principal must be re-established as the leader of innovation. For successful implementation of SBM, the principal should understand the concept and become its prime agent. Dickey (1977) states that, as the key person in the system, the principal must be willing to assume new responsibilities in managing a school center. With the principal's role changed from dependent business manager to autonomous educational leader, and with the teachers able to apply for positions in specific schools, Gasson (1972) sees an inevitable change in the relationships of the central office staff to the principal, and of the principal to the teachers.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The literature reviewed above is useful for establishing broad outlines and objectives of SBM but is less helpful in specifying institutional details, institutional variation, and issues of implementation. Much of the literature is not the product of systematic empirical investigation but rather represents the experience of SBM advocates and program officers about individual programs or sets of programs in limited areas. Research which does provide details of implementation (e.g., David & Peterson, 1984) tends to focus on school improvement and other aspects of organizational dynamics revealed by case studies (see White, 1987). We constructed this study to provide some information on institutional design, variation and implementation across programs, and to provide a foundation for further research on the impact of program variation.

In particular, we felt that the literature was unsatisfactory in answering the following research questions:

- What is the origin of most SBM programs? Is there a prevalent model or models of organization and administration of SBM? What is the size of the typical SBM district (with particular reference to alleged problems of decentralization in larger districts)?

- Are there variations in the type and extent of decentralized authority? How does each type of decentralization involved in SBM (budget, curriculum, hiring) actually work?

- How does decentralization affect the totality of roles in schools and school districts: school board, superintendent, principal, teachers, teachers' union, students? If the typical SBM program follows the strong principal model, is there also a role for faculty governance (as might be suggested by the value of local ownership)? Does the strong principal model affect the administrative structure of the district (for example, the relationship of principal and superintendent)? Does the school-site council change the role of the school board? Do the requirements for changed roles tell us anything about the conditions for successful implementation?

- Is decentralization inconsistent with the recent wave of state activism in education?

- Does SBM appear to be successful, and how is the success of SBM evaluated?

- What are the most common problems of implementation and cost? Do these problems tell us anything about the conditions of successful implementation?

To answer these questions, a snowball sample of 31 school districts sponsoring SBM programs was selected. The sample was taken from 17 states plus the province of Alberta, Canada. Telephone interviews lasting approximately 20 to 45 minutes were conducted with program representatives: a total of 37 respondents (a little more than one per program), including school superintendents, principals, teachers, directors, researchers and others (see Appendix A for list of respondents).[1] Interviews were conducted from a questionnaire with 18 questions in four parts (see Appendix B).[2] An additional 20 districts with SBM programs were identified for purposes of selected statistical comparisons like district size (see Appendix C for a complete list of districts and student enrollments).

Limitations to the methodology of this study include:

- The limited number of respondents per program (a little over one per program). This precluded us from obtaining a perspective based on a variety of points of view.

- The limitation of respondents to program activists and participants. This probably introduced both elite and pro-program biases (suppressing accounts of behavior inconsistent with and unfavorable to the official account).

- The absence of a control group of both typical districts and districts with failed SBM programs. This made it difficult to ascertain whether certain activities were unique to SBM programs or important to program success (for example, the uniqueness and importance of various kinds of curriculum practices).

---

[1] Respondents in Monroe County, Florida, were interviewed by phone and in person as part of a data collection effort covering SBM and other topics.

[2] Part A of the questionnaire concerns origins, basic operation and objectives of the program (important elements, number of schools involved, years established, models relied on, impetus for the program, sources of political support and opposition). Part B concerns issues of centralization and decentralization (nature of increased school-site authority, methods of accountability, consistency with state regulation). Part C asks about changes in the content of teaching and traditional roles. Part D concerns implementation and evaluation.

IV. FINDINGS

This part of the paper discusses our findings related to four areas: basic organization and operation of SBM (for example, the type and degree of decentralization in various districts); impact of that organization on traditional and new roles (for example, changes in the role of the principal and operation of the SBM council); important issues of administration and implementation (for example, accountability and autonomy from external control, criteria of success and methods of evaluation, typical problems of implementation, and cost). Each major section begins with a brief summary of findings.

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

Summary

The philosophy of SBM is surprisingly coherent across many independent programs (educational quality from local control, motivation from local ownership). But the organization and operation of SBM programs is extremely diverse. Programs originate in different ways and in different local contexts with no discernible common model. Common dimensions of decentralization can be identified (decisions on budget, curriculum, and hiring); but programs differ on which dimension is decentralized. Districts seem to decentralize budget most readily, followed by hiring, then curriculum. The most aggressive SBM programs decentralize strongly all three types of decisions. The least aggressive programs try to incorporate selected elements of a more decentralized management style. SBM programs are more common in smaller districts, and larger districts seem to confront more obstacles to decentralization. The superintendent is often a key figure in program initiation. Because of its substantial authority, the SBM council appears to be a significant innovation in educational governance (see also below on changed roles).

This section of the paper provides a basic description of the organization and operation of SBM as revealed in the responses to our questionnaire. Following some descriptive statistics on size of district and number of schools per district is a summary of the duration and origin of the SBM programs in our sample. Then follow three sections on central characteristics of SBM: objectives, type and degree of decentralization, and the SBM council.

Some Descriptive Statistics

Among the many states where SBM programs are located, those with extensive programs in several districts include California, Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, and New Jersey. Size of the sponsoring districts varies. Lunenberg, Massachusetts, one of the smallest, had a 1986-87 student enrollment of approximately 1,600. At the other extreme, Chicago, Houston and Miami (Dade County) are among the largest districts to implement aspects of SBM.

Other large districts have adopted SBM programs, but the majority of SBM programs have been implemented in small and medium-sized districts with student enrollments of less than 30,000. Apparently, SBM is easier to implement in smaller districts. In larger districts, respondents say that central control is necessary to prevent confusion and thus, decentralization of all decisions regarding budget, curriculum and personnel is difficult.

The number of schools per district involved in SBM also varies. Examples of number of schools involved in various districts are: only one of a few schools in Rosemount, Minnesota and Eugene, Oregon; approximately half of the schools Tulsa, Oklahoma; the majority of schools in St. Louis, Missouri and Charleston County, South Carolina; and all of the schools in Duval County, Florida; Monroe County, Florida; Cleveland, Ohio; and Edmonton, Alberta.

Duration and Origin

Some districts have a long tradition of decentralized management, but SBM is relatively new in most districts. Chesterfield, Missouri, has a 34-year tradition of school autonomy, a tradition based on the belief that the school staff, rather than central administrators, have a better understanding of the needs of the school.

Reliance on models from other districts is limited. In general, districts have not taken advantage of the experience of other districts with SBM to enhance success or avoid problems of implementation. Failure to learn from the experience of others may be explained partly by the emphasis of SBM on individual school needs and planning. Exceptions include the Boston School District, which examined documentation on SBM programs in Florida, and the San Diego School District and the Cleveland Public Schools which investigated the prototypical program in Edmonton (Alberta, Canada).

Impetus for starting SBM programs varied. In some states SBM was

encouraged by state legislation. For example, a 1979 Florida law granted funds to districts to establish school advisory committees at each school. In California, the Early Childhood Education Act and the School Improvement Program (SIP) included elements of SBM such as SBM councils and parent involvement in programs. In Dade County, Florida, SBM evolved out of a collective bargaining contract. In Cleveland, Ohio, a court order to desegregate the school district in 1976 also required that the district decentralize personnel selection and resource management. In several districts SBM was initiated by a grant-sponsoring agency which also monitored the projects. For example, the Northwest Area Foundation, located in St. Paul, Minnesota, provided funding for SBM projects in eight school districts, including one district in Oregon, two districts in Washington, and five districts in Minnesota. Similarly, the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) provided SBM training in six New Jersey school districts.

But, in most districts, SBM developed as a result of interest and commitment on the part of the superintendent. Such districts include Boston, Massachusetts; Charleston County, South Carolina; Duval County, Florida; San Diego, California; Sarasota, Florida; St. Louis, Missouri; and Tulsa, Oklahoma. In one instance, where the school board was not very enthusiastic about SBM, a respondent indicated that it was the superintendent who forced the issue. The superintendent often acts in conjunction with other influential actors, like school board, principals, teachers, and parents. Examples of such coalitions include the superintendent, the parents and principal of Willagillespie Community School in Eugene, Oregon; the superintendent and the school board, in Sarasota County, Florida.

SBM programs were initiated in some districts on a pilot basis, with schools volunteering to participate in the program. The goal of a pilot program is to learn what works and thus develop a working model for implementation in other schools. The principal sometimes has a veto over participation in a pilot program. For example, in the Independent School District #196, Rosemount, Minnesota, the principal could decide not to participate even if teachers were fully in support of the program.

Objectives

The most common objective of SBM is school improvement associated with the belief that better decisions will be made if control over decisions is placed as

close to the action as possible. Individuals closest to the educational process will be most aware of the students' needs and therefore will make the best decisions. According to Principal Paula Potter of Beauclerc Elementary School in Duval County, Florida, "If you want to see quality education, then you need to put the emphasis on the school site." The greater budgetary flexibility of SBM programs also is designed to encourage a better match of the educational program with local needs.

SBM programs also aim to increase involvement of school staff, parents and the community (to create a sense of school ownership) and to teach students greater social responsibility. According to one superintendent, in his district there is so much agreement on objectives, and the SBM program is so well integrated, participants hardly know the program is there; "it just exists."

Type and Degree of Decentralization

SBM programs generally involve decentralization of three types of decisions: budget, curriculum, and personnel (hiring). With respect to budget, school staff have discretion to allocate funds according to priorities set at the school level. In most cases, each school is allocated a specific amount for each student. Savings in one area may be used in another area at the discretion of the school. Schools exercise budgetary discretion in choice of educational program, distribution of teachers across programs, and selection of instructional materials. The principal and staff establish priorities to determine the instructional supplies and equipment that best meet students' needs and correspond with teacher preferences and teaching styles.

Some SBM programs give schools the authority to shift funds across personnel categories, choosing the number of teachers, aides, and full-time and part-time positions, as well as between personnel and other categories. Resources made available from staff positions can be used for other purposes, such as new instructional materials. A school might choose to purchase new computers, curtains for the school gymnasium, or encyclopedias for the school library, rather than replacing an aide or guidance counselor.

With respect to curriculum, school staff may develop a new curriculum, or modify or supplement the existing curriculum according to the established needs and priorities of the school. School staff make decisions regarding the selection of textbooks, the selection of learning activities and supplemental instructional

materials to be used, and determine the nature of alternative programs to be offered in the school. Schools have developed new math textbooks, changed their language arts and science curricula, and developed new tutoring programs. One school incorporated refresher math into the Algebra program to better meet the needs of the students. Some schools have developed peer-tutoring programs in an attempt to put an emphasis on thinking skills. New schedules have been developed to better accommodate the needs of students and teachers. State requirements may regulate the length of the school day and school year, but some SBM programs have given the school site the authority to decide when the school day or school year will begin and end. The middle schools of the Edmonds School District in Edmonds, Washington added an eighth period to their previous seven-period day. The purpose of the extra period is to provide additional time and assistance for those who do not complete their assigned work during the "regular day." If students get their work done, then they may leave at the end of the seventh period.

With respect to hiring, individuals at the school site have the authority to hire principals, teachers, and support staff. In some cases the principal has the autonomy to hire both certified and classified staff; in other cases, teachers and SBM councils may be requested to make recommendations or be involved in the screening, interviewing and final selection.

In one case, a SBM council was influential in selecting the first woman and youngest principal in the district, despite wishes of some school staff who supported the promotion of the vice-principal to the position. In another instance, several teachers were involved in the selection of the assistant principal. Twelve candidates were called in for interviews. The teachers narrowed the list to two candidates for final selection by the principal.

Councils may also be involved in the assignment of substitutes, the approval of transfers within and between schools, and the evaluation and recommendation regarding the continued employment of other employees.

What is possible to say about the degree of decentralization? One obstacle to the development of a clear typology is the absence of clear models or programs in many districts. The interview responses indicate that SBM may take the form of programs with specific steps and procedures, or the philosophy of an established arrangement. In some cases it is not as much a matter of implementing a new "program" as further decentralizing a school or district which

already operated under a system of decentralized control. For example, Don Goe, deputy superintendent of Cherry Creek School District in Aurora, Colorado, cannot remember a time when his district did not have SBM. Jefferson County, Colorado has practiced decentralized management for about 18 years, and the Parkway School District in Chesterfield, Missouri has a 34-year tradition of school autonomy. Decentralized management in Jefferson County is perceived more as a philosophy of the district rather than as a program. According to James Dixon, coordinator of the Equal Opportunity Education Program in Chesterfield, Missouri, SBM is an organizing and a philosophical effort that brings decision making under one umbrella.

Keeping in mind that many districts consider SBM more as a frame of mind or an orientation than a structured, technical system, it is possible to group districts into four categories according to the type of decision decentralized:

- comprehensive SBM which decentralizes decisions over all three areas (budget, curriculum, and personnel);
- decentralization of budget and staffing only (curriculum centralized);
- decentralization of budget only;
- elements of decentralized management with no structured decentralization[3]

First, there are districts with comprehensive SBM programs involving decentralization of all three areas of budget, curriculum, and personnel. Comprehensive SBM usually involves all of the schools in the district. Districts with comprehensive SBM programs include Edmonton, Alberta; Dade County, FL; Duval County, FL; and Monroe County, FL.

Second, are districts in which budget and staffing decisions are made at the school site, but curriculum decisions are centralized. School districts with SBM models of this type include San Diego, CA; Cherry Creek School District in

---

[3] Budget was classified as decentralized if budgetary allocations were made at the school site; hiring if the principal or SBM council participated in the hiring process (e.g., interviewing, recommendations); curriculum if the school staff or council made decisions about course offerings, course content, or selection of textbooks. Recall that, given the methodology of this study, classification of programs typically is based on a discussion of each program with one or a few respondents.

Aurora, CO; Jefferson County, CO; Robbinsdale, MN; Rosemount, MN; St. Louis, MO; Jackson, MS; Cleveland, OH; Eugene, OR; and Edmonds, WA. Third, are districts that practice only school-based budgeting, while decisions regarding curriculum and personnel remain centralized. Examples are Rochester, MN; St. Louis Park, MN; Chesterfield, MO; Cincinnati, OH; Tulsa, OK; and Houston, TX.

Fourth, are districts which provide some flexibility in the three areas of budget, curriculum and staffing; but have not developed a structured SBM program. School staffs in these districts may have increased discretion regarding the budget, the ability to make modifications regarding the existing curriculum, or the ability to make recommendations regarding the hiring of new staff. However, they do not have complete autonomy in any of these areas. Districts which fit in this category include Roosevelt School District in Phoenix, Arizona; Milpitas, CA; Adams Arapahoe, CO; Sarasota, FL; Chicago, IL; Boston, MA; Galloway Township, NJ; Perth Amboy, NJ; Oregon City, OR; Charleston, SC; and Salt Lake City, UT.

It is important to keep in mind that districts do not necessarily fit neatly into these categories and that, overtime, districts may switch from one category to another. Factors responsible for evolution and change in SBM programs include decisions made by SBM councils, arrival of a new superintendent, and change in the district's financial situation.

School-Based Management Councils

In addition to decentralization of authority, another fundamental element of the organization of SBM is the SBM council. This section describes the organization and operation of such councils.

Consistent with the literature, the interview responses indicate that SBM councils are a part of nearly every SBM program. In many districts such as Pine Hill School District in Pine Hill, New Jersey and Roosevelt School District in Phoenix, Arizona, the SBM council serves as the main outlet for SBM. In some schools, however, councils were established before the SBM program was initiated. The purpose of the SBM council as outlined by the Pine Hill School District in New Jersey, is "...to provide a cooperative means of improving educational programs and conditions within each school."

Composition and selection of the councils varies. The principal usually serves on the council but is not necessarily the chairperson of the meetings, nor a voting member. Teachers, parents, and community members usually serve; less

common are students and representatives of special groups, like businessmen and women. Students normally serve as members only at the high school level, although one school included fifth and sixth grade students on the council.

The organization and selection process for the SBM council may vary from school to school in the same district. In the Tulsa Public Schools, councils usually have six to eight members at the primary level, eight to ten members at the middle school level, and ten to thirteen members at the high school level. Members are appointed for two- or three-year terms. The school staff recommends candidates to the school board, and the school board appoints them. In the Cincinnati, Ohio, public schools the councils are composed of one-third staff members, one-third parent members and one-third non-parent community members. Members serve two-year terms. Each school decides the basis for selection. Students are included as members at the secondary level and serve for one-year terms.

The decision-making authority of councils varies but is often quite broad. Areas of responsibility include textbook selection, curriculum, and hiring. For example, in some schools, the SBM council interviews and makes recommendations on the hiring of the principal and vice-principal. Because it believed that the district policy was not necessarily in the best interest of all schools, a SBM council in Edmonds, Washington, asked for an exception to district policy. The SBM council at Mount Lake Terrace High School in Edmonds, Washington, made the decision to open a smoking room for students. Pat Cordova, a member of the SBM Council in Edmonds, said that the new policy has actually served to reduce the number of student smokers. Other examples of projects sponsored by SBM councils include a teacher-recognition program, student scholarships, and tutorial programs.

CHANGED ROLES

Summary

The central figure of most SBM programs is the school principal whose role is extended in three directions: closer to the educational process as instructional manager, closer to the staff as mediator of shared governance, and higher in the district chain of command as a person with more authority (e.g., over budget) and accountability (e.g., as the one responsible for success or for failure). The superintendent's role is less active but equally important, because the superintendent can block or disrupt a program or provide it with vital assistance. Other role changes are more subtle. SBM is not generally a system of teacher governance, but teachers experience a greater sense of being listened to and have a greater opportunity to bring about educational improvement. SBM also appears to improve communication with students and parents, especially through the SBM council.

The previous section of the paper described the basic organization and operation of SBM. This and the following section look more deeply at the impact of organizational form. This section considers the impact of SBM on traditional and new roles. When decisions are decentralized, are there changes in traditional roles; which roles change most and least? How do the new structures associated with SBM operate, for example, the SBM council and its relationship with its traditional counterpart, the school board?

Role of the Principal

Respondents agreed that the principal's role changes greatly as a result of SBM. Under SBM, the authority and responsibility of the principal expands in three directions at once: more involvement in the school program, more involvement in shared governance, and a higher level of responsibility in district decision making (e.g., budgets). Principals also are held accountable for achieving the school objectives outlined in the school-site plan. Consistent with the literature, the principal is a key figure in fostering a relationship of shared governance within the school. The difference between a successful and unsuccessful SBM program is often related to the leadership qualities of the principal.

At the same time that the principal's authority is augmented to include hiring and firing of personnel, budget allocations, and curriculum development, the principal also must make decisions cooperatively with teachers and the SBM council. Most decisions involve a group decision-making process rather than the principal making decisions unilaterally. The principal encourages teacher

responsibility and commitment by exchanging information and ideas. A talented principal in a SBM system will find a balance between order and freedom.

Role of the Superintendent

The role of the superintendent also changes importantly under SBM. It is reasonable to say that without the support of the superintendent, decentralization will not occur. The degree of support by the superintendent also influences the outcomes of the program. Because the superintendent is frequently instrumental in introducing SBM to a district, the manner in which he or she chooses to do this may influence both the organizational structure and the attitudes of the school community towards SBM. The superintendent may be influential in promoting the program in particular schools, in encouraging schools to apply for grants, or in contacting experts to provide training sessions. A turnover of superintendents may cause a disruption in program implementation. For example, the Alachua County School District in Gainesville, Florida, was managed under a system of SBM from 1972 until 1977, at which time the district moved back to a more centralized structure because the new superintendent did not support decentralization.

SBM also opens new lines of communication between the superintendent and principals. Respondents from the Edmonton (Alberta, Canada) School District and the Duval County (Jacksonville, Florida) School District, indicated that SBM has established direct lines of communication between the superintendent and the principals. SBM programs require that superintendents meet with principals to monitor school programs on a regular basis to determine the extent to which goals and objectives are being met. Traditional top-down, hierarchical authority of the superintendent and central office staff must be replaced with a relationship of support. Superintendents and central administrators are expected to provide technical assistance to principals. Consequently, the effectiveness of SBM is limited by superintendents and central administrators who are reluctant to share authority.

Role of the School-Based Management Council

Involving the principal, teachers, students, parents and the community through SBM councils has encouraged new relationships and more communication among the members. Members of the council must work together cooperatively.

Depending on how well the members work together as a group, the council may exert a great deal of influence over decisions regarding the budget, curriculum and personnel.

Because of the need for collaboration, the council usually needs training and guidelines on how to work together effectively as a group. Blending of professionals and non-professionals may take some adjustment. Professionals may be reluctant to participate if they have the perception that lay people are telling them how to do their job. Teachers' unions may restrict nonprofessionals from making decisions regarding the hiring and firing of school personnel. While the particular students who serve on the SBM council usually are the most articulate and confident, it is difficult for parents and teachers to learn to listen to students and for students to realize that parents and teachers will listen to them.

Role of the School Board

In many cases the SBM council acts as a "mini" school board with the capacity to respond more rapidly to the needs and issues of the individual school. Overall, respondents did not feel that SBM councils presented a threat to school board authority, but instead felt that, through the councils, the school board has developed a new openness to listening to the needs of individual schools. Conflicts of power and authority may arise if responsibilities of the council overlap with those of the board. To deal with potential conflicts, districts usually outline specific responsibilities for the council. Mount Lake Terrace High School in Edmonds, Washington, also established a negotiating process which specifies procedures to deal with conflicts between SBM council decisions and school board policy.

Role of Teachers

One objective of SBM is to make schools more teacher-centered. While SBM has not required major changes in the roles and responsibilities of teachers, SBM has provided teachers with greater flexibility and the opportunity to make changes. Membership on SBM councils has increased the influence of teachers, as well as communication and cooperation among teachers, parents and other community members. Teachers have more responsibility and authority to organize and coordinate school programs. By working together to develop a school-site plan which includes the school's goals and objectives, teachers are more sensitive

and better able to respond to the needs of the students. Teachers attend training programs to better understand the objectives of SBM, to acquire better skills in working effectively in groups, and to learn to listen more effectively and share ideas with students and parents.

Communication links are also strengthened between teachers and the principal. Rolland Bowers, Associate Superintendent for Financial Services in the Tulsa Public Schools, stated that teachers feel they have more say in the decision-making process and they can express their concerns to the principal.

Teacher reaction to SBM varies. On the one hand, the notion of SBM as something new that has not been done before causes fear and hesitation. On the other hand, teachers are enthusiastic about the increased flexibility and opportunity to set up programs and schedules differently from other schools. Respondents indicated that SBM revived interest in some teachers who had been suffering from teacher burnout. One respondent indicated that the biggest change has been in teachers' attitudes, since the SBM program makes them feel good about themselves and what they are doing. Positive feedback from the community also has made teachers eager to carry-on with the SBM program.

Role of the Teachers' Union

Approximately half of the respondents indicated that the teachers' union or organization did not have any role in the program, while the other half reported that the teachers' union has been very supportive. Some states, such as South Carolina, do not have a teachers' union or organization. Superintendent Tom Payzant of San Diego reported that the teachers' union has been supportive of any aspect of SBM which has enabled it to get more involved in decision making at the school site, but the union has not been supportive of aspects of SBM that give more authority to principals. Rolland Bowers, associate superintendent for financial services in Tulsa, Oklahoma, indicated that the teachers' union has had a direct influence on the development of the SBM program and it has been supportive since its vice-president serves on the district-wide task force and thus, has been informed of the process and developments each step of the way. According to SBM Director Francis Martines, the teachers' union in Cleveland, Ohio, has provided passive, rather than active support.

Role of Students, Parents and Communit

Student involvement has not been greatly increased as a result of SBM; but respondents indicated that SBM has given students a greater sense of ownership regarding the school. Participation on SBM councils has given specific students a better understanding of the operations of the school and school decision making. Improved relations between students and teachers have been observed through increased respect for teachers and fewer problems of vandalism. Respondents indicated that SBM has directly benefitted students by developing programs and activities geared specifically to their needs. Ideas generated by SBM councils have served as vehicles to pursue enrichment of students' needs.

Respondents indicated that SBM has served to improve communication between the school and the community. SBM has increased parental involvement in school activities and given parents a more meaningful role in what their kids learn at school. Parents have an outlet, through SBM councils, to express their concerns. Francis Martines, director of SBM, Cleveland Public Schools, indicated that since the initiation of SBM, more people have attended school community meetings than ever before. Improved communication has increased the parents' respect of teachers. As one respondent reported, "They [the parents] see that the education program is being geared to the needs of their child."

The school community is better informed about school organization and school activities as a result of newsletters sent out by the SBM council. While SBM programs have served to increase parents' participation in school decision making, and to increase the community's knowledge of school activities, the non-parent community's participation has not been very extensive.

ISSUES IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

Summary

According to the program participants we interviewed, SBM represents, in effect, a superior blend of accountability and autonomy. Accountability is increased because of clear lines of responsibility between principal and superintendent and between school officials (especially the principal) and the community. Autonomy is increased because of SBM's emphasis on decentralization and non-interference from state and district regulation (respondents claim that such regulation pertains to objectives rather than process). Criteria of success for SBM programs pertain to process rather than outcomes (increased autonomy, flexibility, communication). Systematic monitoring is rare, whether of student achievement or other outcomes.

Implementation problems revolve around the difficulty of the new roles demanded by SBM. Principals may lack the disposition and training for new types of decisions and relationships. Teachers may lack time and resources for a new form of staff development. Participation of parents and students on the council is often difficult to maintain on a consistent basis. Costs of SBM are relatively minor; unfunded costs occur mostly in the area of training; and participants claim considerable cost-efficiencies from decentralized management.

Preceding sections of this paper have considered organization and the impact of organization on roles. This section looks at three issues of particular interest in the administration and implementation of SBM programs: autonomy and accountability to external authority; criteria of success and methods of evaluation; implementation problems and costs.

Autonomy and Accountability to External Authority

The majority of respondents indicated that, with SBM, the school remains more accountable than ever to the district and the state. Respondents indicated that principals were held more accountable as a result of SBM. Unlike the situation with a centralized management system, respondents from Edmonton, Alberta; Jefferson County, Colorado and Duval County, Florida said SBM makes the principal more accountable since the principal reports directly to the superintendent. According to Pat Bower, coordinator of local school administration, Charleston County, South Carolina, "If the program does not succeed, they don't fire the community, they fire the principal." Schools are also held accountable through the school plan and school budget which they are required to submit to the school board each year.

While teachers and principals may accept new responsibilities, respondents indicated that the superintendent remains the instructional leader of the district and remains accountable to citizens and the school board. Diane Skiff of the Local School Advisory Committees (LSAC) in Cincinnati, Ohio, stated that while SBM has given LSAC increased authority regarding the budget and the hiring of school staff, there are certain caveats concerning what a local school can and cannot do. If a proposal does not go against state law or board policy, then it is likely that the LSAC can get the policy approved.

If schools are even more accountable under SBM than centralized management, what about the flip side of the coin--can they retain their

autonomy, especially in light of increasing state control of education? Interestingly, most respondents did not feel that a trend of increased state control of education existed in their states. Several respondents indicated that it was the trend of the state to put a heavy emphasis on local control. Bob Smilanich of the Edmonton Public School District (in Canada), indicated that any trend of increased state control of education would be contrary to the goals of SBM. Traditionally, the procedure has been for the state to tell the schools what to do, but with SBM, the schools are told the desired results and the process is left up to the individual schools. Several respondents indicated that they felt there was a proper balance between state and local control, with the state providing standards about what should be taught, and the individual schools determining how it should be taught. One superintendent even said that the state has gone too far in giving principals too much authority. The superintendent stated that decisions such as setting credit requirements for graduation should be set by the district, since discrimination will result when different standards and conditions are set by individual schools.

Criteria of Success and Methods of Evaluation

In evaluating the overall success of their programs, respondents agreed that principals, staff, parents and students support SBM since they like to be in control of their own destiny. Principal Paula Potter, Beauclerc Elementary School in Duval County, Florida, said she was extremely happy with the SBM program and that 99 percent of the principals in the district would agree with her. She said she appreciated having direct access to the superintendent and she felt that this generated a high level of trust. According to Pat Bower, coordinator of local school administration in Charleston County, South Carolina, improved test scores in every subject area indicate the success of the program as well as positive attitudes on the part of teachers. Respondents expressed their support of the concept of shared decision making and indicated that SBM councils have improved relations between the school and the community. Diane Skiff, of the Local School Advisory Committee in Cincinnati, supported the advantages of giving decision-making authority to the SBM council by stating, "A group makes a better decision than an individual, any day."

May Wong, education specialist, Boston Public Schools, stated that the most successful aspect of SBM has been the flexibility that it has given individual

schools regarding the budget. Schools have come up with innovative ways to save money, and any money that is saved may be allocated for discretionary purposes such as field trips or student rewards. Superintendent Tom Payzant of San Diego indicated that the most successful aspects of SBM have been in the areas of budget and staffing. Principals and staff have discretionary decision-making power regarding the allocation of resources; and, in terms of staff allocation for various units, they have a fair amount of autonomy. However, Payzant remarked that, while principals have the authority to decide the number of teachers and aides in each area, and the number of full-time and part-time positions, union contracts take away a great deal of flexibility. Principals in the San Diego SBM program do not have the authority to determine who will be hired.

Given criteria of success that seem to emphasize process, systematic evaluation of outcomes seems rather unlikely, and such proved to be the case. One superintendent said that there was not any need to develop an elaborate evaluation system to monitor the progress of the SBM program because he could see the results. As he put it, "we truly have it" and "it just works."

Other than yearly school-site plans and school surveys, SBM programs have not established procedures to monitor the progress of the program toward specific objectives. In a few of the districts where SBM was introduced recently, respondents indicated that initially there had been a system for monitoring the program, but there no longer was a formal system of evaluation. Programs supported by grants were monitored initially by the sponsoring agency; but the monitoring was discontinued once the grant expired.

Few attempts have been made to monitor the effects of SBM on student outcomes. Only one district interviewed reported that student testing was a part of the SBM program. While most of the respondents indicated that there was an extensive testing program in the schools, there was variation as to the reporting of the results to the state and district, and the extent to which these results were compared with other schools and districts. One principal indicated that test results were not compared since it would be impossible to say that one school was better than another on this basis.

Central staff visits, interviews with and reports from principals, and reports from the SBM team, have served as ordinary mechanisms of evaluating SBM. In many districts, principals and SBM councils are responsible for reviewing their school-site plan every year to determine its strengths and weaknesses and to

write up new program objectives. The SBM schools in Charleston County are monitored on a quarterly basis, through school-site visits and quarterly reports. In the Boston and St. Louis public schools, questionnaires have been sent out to individual schools to determine the pros and cons of the program. Francis Martines, director of SBM for the Cleveland Public Schools, indicated that several consultants have been responsible for the monitoring of implementation objectives of SBM, but not necessarily product objectives.

Implementation Problems and Program Costs

Almost all of the implementation problems and costs associated with SBM revolved around the difficulty of the new roles (inability to perform the roles, need for training, and so on). Respondents indicated that one of the most serious problems in implementation is apprehension on the part of principals, teachers, and other actors, who are fearful of what might be required of them. Difficulties are posed in breaking down people's perceptions concerning a new program. Individuals do not always have a complete understanding of what SBM involves, how much authority teachers and SBM councils actually have, or who is in charge.

Many principals have inadequate guidance, experience or resources to meet the objectives expected of them. For example, many principals do not have budgetary experience and are ill-prepared to make decisions regarding the school budget. Principals used to the traditional top-down management system are resistant to the adoption of a new system of management and are reluctant to give up or share any of their authority. As one respondent quoted a principal as saying, "Do you think I'm going to let my teachers have that kind of say?" Respondents indicated that the personality of the principal plays an extremely important role in the success of the program. According to Bob Smilanich, associate superintendent of curriculum, Edmonton Public School District, the principal is no longer the mediator and must be able to function without the traditional top-down direction.

In some cases, respondents felt that the program was not as successful as it might have been due to lack of support on the part of the superintendent. In the case of the Independent School District #196 in Rosemount, Minnesota, there were five different superintendents within a five-year period. With a turnover rate this high, there was a lack of enthusiasm and knowledge of the program.

Not all teachers want increased decision-making authority and some prefer

more centralized direction. Reluctant to share their power, central administrators and superintendents may oppose decentralization. A district official indicated that it is difficult for individuals to make a switch in mentality and to use the flexibility that they are allowed to its fullest potential. SBM also can be a very time-consuming process; principals and teachers, already burdened with time-consuming activities, sometimes do not have the time to assume new responsibilities.

Implementation problems also arose with respect to the new roles on the SBM council. Turnover in membership on the SBM council may generate a lack of knowledge and enthusiasm for the program since it may take several months for the members to get started and become accustomed to working together. Student participation on the SBM council has not been very active. An explanation offered for this is that students who serve on the council are usually the most actively involved students in the school and, thus, do not have enough time to devote to yet one more responsibility. This explanation also applies to teacher and parent involvement. The first members to sit on the council are usually the most powerful and committed teachers and parents. Once their term is up it is often difficult to get new people involved. Many new innovations and creative ideas may develop during the first term of membership; but, in the second term and terms thereafter, the council frequently ends up reinstating old ideas. This factor may serve to reinforce accountability to the district and state since as one principal put it, "Most councils are not creative enough to come up with ideas which go against state laws or district policy."

A final complaint stated about SBM is that decision-making authority is not necessarily redirected within the school, but instead is simply given to people who have traditionally been in charge. For example, those individuals who are normally school and community leaders end up on the SBM councils.

Increased training is an obvious response to the difficulty of the roles involved in SBM, and lack of training did surface as a problem. Some respondents said that they had not been given an adequate orientation to the program and not enough time was allotted to create an environment of change. It takes a long time for real change to come about. The amount of training provided to develop an understanding of SBM varies from program to program. The length of training may range anywhere from a few days to as long as five years. In schools or districts where very little training was provided, participants

complained that they had been given inadequate orientation to the program. In other programs, training is a consistent aspect of the program and frequent workshops are provided to help teachers, principals and parents develop new skills and prepare for new roles and responsibilities.

In terms of program costs, the overall response was that SBM involves little additional cost and may actually save money. Planning is one category of increased cost, especially the long-range planning associated with program development. Some schools received grants during their initiation period from organizations such as the Danforth Foundation or the Northwest Area Foundation. One respondent indicated that the only additional cost of SBM is the cost of retraining staff. Substitute teachers are needed while regular teachers attend training workshops. There is also the cost of consultants and the operation of the local advisory committee office. Some districts operating under fiscal constraints have faced difficulties in providing for the extensive retraining and restructuring needed to establish SBM programs.

Offsetting the increased costs of SBM are the alleged savings produced from more efficient operations. Schools with school-based budgeting indicated that they spend the same amount of money as other schools, but they spend it more efficiently because they do not waste it on programs and materials they do not need. Savings may also flow from reductions in district administration. Administrators of the program in Monroe County, Florida, stated that it would be difficult to expand the central office staff because "teachers and principals can subtract just as well as we can."

V. CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The need for further research is an appropriate way to conclude this paper. This study (a relatively modest telephone survey) was consciously designed to go beyond existing research in providing details of organization and implementation. One of the purposes of developing additional detail was to identify areas justifying more intensive investigation.

Future research might begin with more detail about types and degrees of decentralization and comparison with typical centralized districts. Our information about decentralization of curriculum (the least common area of decentralization under SBM) is fragmentary and anecdotal and provides a problematic contrast with ordinary districts.

The most conspicuous outstanding research issue flows out of the findings of program diversity and the typical lack of systematic evaluation of SBM programs. Given a very large range of decentralization, and practically uniform expressions of satisfaction, the obvious question is whether type and degree of decentralization make any difference. It would be important for policy makers to know whether practically all of the benefits of decentralization accrue to a very modest effort; and what are the benefits of a more complete system. Future research efforts might select a sample of programs based on type and degree of decentralization and make a serious effort to measure a set of effects (both process and outcomes: student achievement as well as participant satisfaction, sense of empowerment, degree of implementation difficulties).

A third set of issues revolves around findings about organizational roles, especially the importance of administrators (principal, superintendent) and the relative lack of importance of other actors (teachers, teachers' unions, parents, students). On the one hand, it would be useful to know more about how programs manage to combine a strong principal with shared governance. We received some indication that teacher participation in administrator-dominated districts is mostly symbolic (because administrators make decisions ahead of time, control the agendas for meetings, filter community input, etc.). On the other hand, our respondents claimed that teachers are listened to under SBM and are able to effectuate educational improvement. To unravel these issues, researchers would need to probe much deeper into patterns of communication and interaction

than we were able to do in our study (see also David & Peterson, 1984, on this issue).

A fourth set of issues concerns implementation difficulties and costs. Our respondents emphasized the importance of the personality of the principal and superintendent, and adequate training for administrators and other actors (teachers, members of the council). These comments suggest the value of a closer look at issues of selection and training. Some districts probably have superior programs of selection and training which could be shared with other districts. All districts should be made aware of the importance of these issues and the need to set aside sufficient time and resources for training and staff development.

A fifth set of issues concerns possible conflicts with state and district regulation. The position taken by respondents in this study will come as a considerable surprise to many people (the compatibility of regulation with site autonomy and the focus of regulation on objectives rather than process). For example, increasing state and local regulation of the curriculum seems plainly inconsistent with curriculum decentralization. Of course, regulation of the curriculum is the most common and detailed form of contemporary regulation; curriculum is the type of decision least commonly decentralized under SBM; and the lack of conflict in some districts may be due to unusually permissive regulation. It would be important to know if the compatibility of SBM with state and local regulation is mainly a product of local concessions to that type of regulation in many districts.

Finally, are two sets of broader, institutional issues. One kind of study might direct its attention to the long-term fate of SBM programs, why some succeed and others fail. Most of the programs in our study are quite new, and all were said to be successful. A longitudinal comparison of programs over time (perhaps combined with a study of outcomes) might yield some interesting information about the factors responsible for stable institutionalization. A related question is the role of district and state. It would be interesting to know how political entities with ultimate authority over the schools managed to sustain the program of decentralization and avoid periodic efforts to regain centralized control.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS

Allen, Henriette, Administrative Assistant for Research, Planning, Evaluation and Board Relations, Jackson Public School District, Jackson, Mississippi, Telephone Interview, 3 March 1987.

Archer, Glynn, Assistant Superintendent For Instruction, Monroe County, Key West, Florida, Personal Interview, 17 February 1987, Phone Interview, 27 July 1987.

Bower, Pat, Coordinator of Local School Administration, Charleston, South Carolina, Telephone Interview, 11 December 1986.

Bowers, Rolland, Associate Superintendent For Financial Services, Tulsa Public Schools, Telephone Interview, 12 January 1987.

Cline, Pauline, Principal, Mount Lake Terrace High School, Edmonds School District, Edmonds, Washington, Telephone Interview, 19 February 1987.

Cordova, Pat, School-Based Management Team Leader, Mount Lake Terrace High School, Edmonds School District, Edmonds, Washington, Telephone Interview, 19 February 1987.

Davis, Mary, Teacher and School-Based Management Council Member, Pomona School, Galloway Township, New Jersey, Telephone Interview, 9 March 1987.

Dixon, James, Coordinator, Equal Opportunity Education Program, Parkway School System, Chesterfield, Missouri, Telephone Interview, 4 March 1987.

Gardiner, Sue, Community School Coordinator, Willagillespie Community School, Eugene, Oregon, Telephone Interview, 27 January 1987.

Gowler, Doug, Principal, Sagebrush Elementary School, Cherry Creek School District, Aurora, Colorado, Telephone Interview, 22 January 1987.

Henriquez, Armando, Superintendent of Schools, Monroe County, Key West, Florida, Personal Interview, 17 February 1987.

Ledford, Robert, Director of Secondary Education, Edmonds School District # 15, Edmonds, Washington, Telephone Interview, 23 February 1987.

Lee, Joseph, Deputy Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, Illinois, Telephone Interview, 6 March 1987.

Martines, Francis, Director School-Based Management, Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio, Telephone Interview, 12 January 1987.

Minzenmayer, Betty, Assistant Superintendent for School Management, Houston, Texas, Telephone Interview, 23 February 1987.

Niland, Thomas, Principal, Pomona School, Galloway Township, New Jersey, Telephone Interview, 9 March 1987.

Owens, Jack, Director of School Supervision and Support, Milpitas School District, California, Telephone Interview, 8 December 1986.

Payzant, Tom, Superintendent, San Diego Unified School District, California, Telephone Interview, 7 January 1987.

Potter, Paula, Principal, Beauclerc Elementary School, Duval County, Jacksonville, Florida, Telephone Interview, 16 January 1987.

Richardson, Herbert, Principal, Public School #10, Perth Amboy, New Jersey, Telephone Interview, 10 March 1987.

Sande, Robert, Principal, Jefferson Elementary School, Rochester Independent School District, Rochester, Minnesota, Telephone Interview, 20 February 1987.

Sang, Herb, Superintendent, Duval County Public Schools, Jacksonville, Florida, Telephone Interview, 15 January 1987.

Scarbrough, George, Director of Secondary Education, Independent School District #281, Robbinsdale, Minnesota, Telephone Interview, 23 February 1987.

Shiff, Sue, Staff Developer, Jefferson County Public Schools, Colorado, Telephone Interview, 20 January, 1987.

Skiff, Diane, Associate, Local School Advisory Committee (LSAC), Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio, 8 January 1987.

Smilanich, Bob, Associate Superintendent For Curriculum, Edmonton Public School District, Alberta, Canada, Telephone Interview, 19 December 1986.

Sullivan, Patrick, Principal, Independent School District #196, Rosemount, Minnesota, Telephone Interview, 27 January 1987.

Tank, Don, Deputy Superintendent, Clackamas County School District #62, Oregon City Public Schools, Oregon City, Oregon, Telephone Interview, 26 January 1987.

Thomas, Hadley, Assistant Superintendent, Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, Arizona, Telephone Interview, 24 March 1987.

Tornillo, Pat, Executive Vice-President, United Teachers of Dade, Chief Negotiator, Dade County, Florida, Telephone Interview, 15 December 1986.

Tracey, Kitty, Educational Specialist, Sarasota County, Florida, Telephone Interview, 21 November 1986.

Vedra, Ken, Director of Budget and Finance, Adams Arapahoe 28J School District, Colorado, Telephone Interview, 6 January 1987.

Wakefield, Robert, Public Information Officer, Salt Lake City District, Salt Lake City, Utah, Telephone Interview, 5 March 1987.

Walker, Kay, Project Administrative Assistant, Susan Lindgren School, St. Louis Park, Minnesota, Telephone Interview, 18 February 1987.

Wiesner, Glenn, Project Manager School-Based Management, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri, Telephone Interview, 14 January 1987.

Wong, May, Educational Specialist, Boston Public Schools, Boston, Massachusetts, Telephone Interview, 5 January 1987.

Wyman, Ted, Teacher, Valley Middle School, Independent School District # 196, Rosemount, Minnesota, Telephone Interview, 27 January 1987.

APPENDIX B: SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Part A

A1. Please give a general description of your program. What do you think are its most important elements? How many years has your district been involved with SBM? How many schools are in your district and how many are involved with SBM?

A2. Does the program follow or grow out of some model of school-based management and, if so, what?

A3. What was the impetus for the program (who pushed for it)?

A4. What are the objectives of the program?

A5. Do various groups agree on these objectives? If there is disagreement, what are the different positions and who takes these positions?

Part B

B1. School-based management implies more authority at the school site. What kind of authority has been increased in your program?

B2. Does the school remain accountable to the district and state, and, if so, how?

B3. How is the program of increased local autonomy reconciled with the trend toward increasing state control of education, if such a trend exists in your state?

Part C

C1. Does the program include any changes in the content of education, such as curriculum, textbooks, ability grouping, promotional policies?

C2. Does the program include any changes in the work of teachers, such as new schedules, new authority and responsibilities?

C3. Does the program involve changes in the governance and communication process within the school, such as new patterns of participation, new arrangements of authority between administrators and teachers?

C4. Does the program involve any changes in relationships or governance between the school and students, parents, and/or the community?

C5. What is the role of the teachers' union or organization in your program? Has the union, organization been supportive or not?

Part D

D1. What kind of student testing is in effect in your school, district? Are the results reported to the state or district? Are schools and districts compared with each other on standardized tests in your state? Is student testing part of the school-based management program? Are student testing and school-based management consistent or do they work at cross purposes?

D2. How would you have characterized the implementation of the program to this point? Have there been any problems of implementation, and, if so, what were they?

D3. How would you describe the overall success of the program? Which areas are more or less successful and why?

D4. Do you have any information on program costs?

D5. Is there some system for monitoring the progress of the program toward its objectives and, if so, what?

Could you send any additional information regarding your program?

Is there anyone else knowledgeable on your program that could be contacted for further information or a different perspective?

APPENDIX C: STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

Student Enrollments (1986-87 school year, rounded to nearest 1,000)

Districts Interviewed:

Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, Arizona	11,000
Milpitis Unified School District, California	7,600
San Diego Unified School District, California	115,000
Adams Arapahoe, Colorado	25,000
Cherry Creek School District, Aurora, Colorado	26,000
Jefferson County, Colorado	76,000
Dade County, Florida	236,000
Duval County, Florida	102,000
Monroe County, Florida	7,000
Sarasota County, Florida	25,000
Chicago, Illinois	430,000
Boston, Massachusetts	57,000
Rochester, Minnesota	13,000
Robbinsdale, Minnesota	14,000
Rosemount, Minnesota	16,000
St. Louis Park, Minnesota	5,000
Jackson, Mississippi	33,000
Chesterfield, Missouri	23,000
St. Louis, Missouri	80,000
Galloway Township, New Jersey	2,000
Perth Amboy, New Jersey	6,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	52,000
Cleveland, Ohio	73,000
Tulsa, Oklahoma	45,000
Eugene, Oregon	27,000
Oregon City, Oregon	6,000
Charleston, South Carolina	43,000
Houston, Texas	195,000
Salt Lake City, Utah	24,000
Edmonds, Washington	17,000
Edmonton, Alberta (Canada)	65,000

Other Districts with SBM Programs:

Fairfield-Suison Unified, Fairfield, California	15,000
Irvine Unified, Irvine, California	19,000
Mt. Diablo Unified, Concord, California	31,000
Oak Grove School District, San Jose, California	12,000
Alachua County, Florida	23,000
Broward County, Florida	131,000
Martin County, Florida	10,000
Lunenberg, Massachusetts	2,000
Detroit, Michigan	180,000

Lansing, Michigan	23,000
Hopkins Independent School District, Minnesota	7,000
Kansas City, Missouri	35,000
East Windsor, New Jersey	5,000
Pine Hill, New Jersey	3,000
South Brunswick Township, New Jersey	3,000
Vernon Township, New Jersey	4,000
Portland, Oregon	51,000
Mercer Island, Washington	3,000

Source: CIC's School Directory, School Year 1986/87, Market Data Retrieval, Rand McNally & Co.

REFERENCES

Beaubier, E.W., & Thayer, A. N., Eds. 1973. Participative management-Decentralized decision making: Working models. Burlingame, CA: California Association of School Administrators.

Benveniste, G. 1984. The design of school accountability systems. In J. W. Guthrie & M. W. Kirst, Eds., Data-based accountability in education. Stanford, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Caldwell, B. J. 1978 (June). Implementation of decentralized school budgeting. Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education, Toronto, Ontario.

California State Department of Education. 1977. Establishing school-site councils: California School Improvement Program. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Caputo, E. 1980 (November). Freedom, order and school-based management: One principal's story. Principal, 25-27.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. 1986. A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

David, J. L., & Peterson, S. M. 1984. Can schools improve themselves? A study of school-based improvement programs. Palo Alto, CA: Bay Area Research Group.

Dickey, W. K. 1977. School-site budgeting: A school administrator's view. Educational Economics, 15-17.

Educational Alternatives Committee. 1982. Rebuilding education to make it work. Minneapolis, MN: Citizens League.

Garms, W., Guthrie, J., & Pierce, L. 1978. School finance: The economics and politics of public education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gasson, J. 1972. Autonomy: The precursor to change in elementary schools. National Elementary Principal, 52(3), 83-85.

Greenhalgh, J. 1984. School-site budgeting: Decentralized school management. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Guthrie, J. W. 1977. Creating efficient schools: The wonder is they work at all. Proceedings of the Financing of Quality Education Symposium (1-27). Rochester, NY: Urban League of Rochester New York, Inc.

Knight, P. 1985. The practice of school-based curriculum development. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17(1), 37-48.

Lindelow, J. 1981. School-based management. In S. C. Smith, J. Mazzarella & P. K. Piele, Eds., School leadership: Handbook for survival. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Marburger, C. 1985. One school at a time: School-based management-A process for change. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R., Jr. 1982. In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. Cambridge, MA: Harper & Row.

Pierce, L. C. 1976. Emerging policy issues in public education. Phi Delta Kappan, 58(2), 173-176.

Pierce, L. C. 1977. School-site management. Palo Alto, CA: Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

Prasch, J. C. 1984, October. Reversing the trend toward centralization. Educational Leadership, 42(2), 27-29.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. 1985. School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal, 85, 353-389.

Tyack, D. B. 1974. The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U. S. Department of Education. 1984 (May). The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Weischadle, D. 1980. School-based management and the principal. The Clearinghouse, 54(2), 53-55.

Weisner, G. 1987 (January). The shape of school-based management. Unpublished handout for Department of Curriculum and Programs, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

White, P. 1988. Resource materials on school-based management. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.